



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is the style that puts the Germans to shame and makes English writers despair. Everyone interested in the subject ought to procure the volume, not expecting a systematic philosophy of religion, but a series of suggestions, enlivening in themselves, and raising several problems that have hitherto received too scanty attention. I am glad to notice that a second edition has already been called for. A full index would be a welcome addition.

R. M. WENLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By FRANK BYRON JEVONS, M.A., LITT.D. London: Methuen & Co., 1897. Pp. vii + 443; cloth. 10s. 6d.

THIS introduction to the history of religion deserves high commendation for its modesty, impartiality of tone, and suggestiveness. Though pretending to be little more than a compilation from authorities on anthropology, it really is—from the discriminating use of its material and the philosophical power of the author—an original and valuable contribution to the study of early religion, and therefore to the study of all religion. In studying any subject we must begin at the beginning. It bears, too, on those large problems, raised by biblical introduction, which are to be solved neither by the old dogmatism which rested on uncritical tradition nor by the new and sometimes snuffy dogmatism of modern literary criticism. Both of these dogmatisms have done good service in their time; but the time has come for something better. A patient and thorough investigation of all the facts is now demanded. That is being carried on, but much labor is still needed to complete the work. Clearly, too, no other method but the comparative can be used to ascertain wherein the things investigated—whether religions or anything else—resemble each other and wherein they differ. For though some who are rightly reluctant to appear to compromise the exclusive claims of Christianity are jealous of a method which to them implies that all religions are alike, they must on consideration admit that, just as comparative philology implies that languages differ from each other and comparative anatomy implies that animals differ in structure, so the use of the comparative method in the study of religions “is a standing disproof of the idea that all religions are alike.” “The comparative method can only be used where there are differences in the things compared. Indeed, we may go further and say that it is

for the sake of ascertaining these differences that the method is brought into use." Thus, for example, it is a small thing for anyone to point out the resemblances which exist, on the one hand, between the cosmogony and the flood traditions found inscribed on the tablets of Nineveh and transliterated from older sources or found in the valley of the Nile, and those accounts, on the other hand, which we have in the book of Genesis concerning the creation of the world and the Noachian deluge. Surely, it is of much more consequence to insist on the great differences, and to seek for an adequate explanation of that spiritual elevation and the entire absence of crude mythological and polytheistic accessories in the biblical stories which make them still profitable reading for young and old, and for the man of science as well as for the man on the street. There are, however, people who become so fascinated with the resemblances on the surface that they jump to the conclusion that no difference worth speaking of exists between the Bible and Babylonian or Turanian or Hamitic tradition. There are others, again, so terrified because such a conclusion has been formed and announced to the world that they feel it their duty to deny the resemblance, and to denounce those who admit it as false brethren. The same spirit makes them cry, Can anything good come out of anthropology? as soon as they are informed that some anthropologists have assumed that all religion is merely developed fetichism or animism or something of the sort. Between the impatient unbeliever and the impatient believer the man of science and the man of faith walk together, hand in hand, enriching the world, and resting on the word, "He that believeth doth not make haste." Let us have the facts, all the facts, and, if possible, nothing but the facts, is today the cry of sensible men; and therefore it is that a book like Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, concerning which Dr. Jevons writes, "My obligations are too great for their expression to be confined in footnotes," is worth all the eloquent declamation of defenders of the faith in church courts, or all the "guesses" at the riddle of existence which the most accomplished man of letters can give us.

Totemism, that is, the belief which identified with the divine a species of animals or plants which was regarded as the ancestor of the tribe, is the earliest form of religion known to science. It may be added that the worship originally accorded to the whole species was after a time appropriated to one individual of the species. As to this faith, while no authority now accepts Mr. Spencer's theory that it originated in the worship of ancestors, it is admitted that "the nature of

religious belief in the pre-totemistic stage is entirely matter of conjecture." Dr. Jevons argues with much acuteness that pre-totemism must have been a "simple and amorphous monotheism." He takes issue squarely with those who maintain that as monotheism is the highest form of belief, it must have gradually developed from the lower forms of totemism and polytheism, through intermediate stages. Admitting every plea that seems to make for the ordinary evolutionary view, that the higher must have developed from the lower, he strongly insists that the highest must have been implicit in consciousness from the beginning, and also that evolution and progress are two very different things. Evolution is constant, but progress very rare. Indeed, "evolution may well be, from the religious point of view, one long process of degeneration." Progress is certainly as exceptional in religion as in other things, and where it takes place must be due to exceptional causes. "If evolution takes place, something must be evolved; and that something, as being continuously present in all the different stages, may be called the *continuum* of religion." He thus finds in the consciousness of primitive man that which only became fully explicit, millenniums after his appearance on earth. He puts this point again, near the end of his work, in the following striking passage:

"Once more, we must remember that the facts of consciousness were the same for early as for civilized man; but they were not as yet discriminated. They swam before man's untrained eye, and ran into one another. Even the fundamental division of objects into animate and inanimate had not been fixed. But even so, all was not irrational chaos for man. In the outer world of his experience the laws of nature, which are God's laws, worked with the same regularity then as now. In the world of his inner experience God was not far from him at any time. If he could not formulate the laws of nature, at least he had the key to their comprehension in the conviction, not expressed but acted on, that nature was uniform. If his spiritual vision was dim, his consciousness of God was at least so strong, to start with, that he has never since ceased seeking after him. The law of continuity holds of religion as of other things."

What more natural form of belief, in this primitive stage of existence, could there be than the conception of God as manifesting himself in some natural object! No wonder that totemism was world-wide. "The haunting sense of something incomprehensible, and therefore divine, has to be objectified in some form, and that form or totem becomes

the vehicle for the ideal union of the family or tribe." (*Christianity and Idealism*, by Professor John Watson.)

Most suggestive are the chapters on "Totemism and Survivals of Totemism," especially the argument that "totemism was the prime motor of all material progress." Progress would have been impossible without the domestication of animals and of plants, and success in either direction demanded labor and experimentation, for which the savage is naturally incapable. Only "in totemism have we a cause persistent, world-wide, and adequate to account for the facts." What we consider a form of religion so crude as to excite surprise and pity was thus indispensable to any material civilization! The lowest religion is clearly better than none.

The development of totemism into polytheism, through the offering of totem animals in sacrifice, marked another important stage in the history of humanity. When it was felt that the union of the human and divine was broken, some outward act was needed which would signify the reestablishment of the connection. As the totem was supposed to share the common life of both parties and to be capable of exercising an influence on both, and as a blood covenant was the only means known for effecting union with anyone external to the tribe, the sacrifice of the totem and a common sacramental meal originated. The universality of the practice is the most conclusive testimony to the ineradicable craving of man's heart for union and communion with God, and to the consciousness that on such union alone can right relations with our fellows be based. Here is Dr. Jevons' language: "The whole human race for thousands of years has been educated to the conception that it was only through a divine sacrifice that perfect union with God was possible for man. At times the sacramental conception of sacrifice appeared to be about to degenerate entirely into the gift theory; but then, in the sixth century, B. C., the sacramental conception woke into new life, this time in the form of a search for a perfect sacrifice—a search which led Clement and Cyprian to try all the mysteries of Greece in vain. But of all the great religions of the world it is the Christian church alone which is so far heir of all the ages as to fulfill the dumb, dim expectation of mankind; in it alone the sacramental meal commemorates by ordinance of its founder the divine sacrifice which is a propitiation for the sins of all mankind."

His argument against the derivation of monotheism from polytheism is very decided, and will not be assented to by many who are ready to acknowledge that Jewish monotheism was due to a peculiar cause,

whether the cause be called special revelation, or greater power of spiritual insight on the part of the prophets of Israel, or the peculiar character and history of the "people of revelation." Admittedly, the development of religion in Israel was unique. There was no intermediate stage of polytheism. The teraphim or household gods of patriarchal times are evidences of primitive totemism, existing side by side with the higher revelation made to Abraham. Subsequently we find evidences of a worship of the great powers of nature side by side with the spiritual faith of Abraham and Moses. Syncretism, too, we find in Israel, but not polytheism. Faith in Jehovah, the God of Israel, developed into pure monotheism, and that into the perfect conception of God which Jesus revealed. But many who admit this unique development of religion in Israel hold just as firmly that the religion of Greece developed from the polytheism of Homer into the monotheism of its great poets and philosophers, a monotheism which at its best, in Plato, for instance, regarded God as simply transcendent, and which, therefore, was incomplete, but which none the less was spiritual monotheism. Dr. Jevons is a well-known classical scholar, and cannot have overlooked the case of Greece. Yet here are some of the sweeping assertions which he makes regarding the interrelations of monotheism and polytheism :

"Indeed, if we base ourselves on evolutionary principles we may safely say that, whatever be the genesis and history of monotheism, one thing is certain, namely, that it cannot have developed out of polytheism. Both species may be descended from a common ancestor, but not one from the other." (P. 387.)

"The monotheism of the Jews is a unique and solitary phenomenon in the history of religion. Nowhere else in the world has the development of religion culminated in monotheism." (P. 388.)

"The tendencies which have been supposed in polytheism to make for monotheism have always been purely pantheistic—speculative rather than practical, metaphysical rather than religious ; and, as being metaphysical speculations, have always been confined to the cultured few, and have never even leavened the polytheism of the masses." (P. 389.)

"Pantheism is the philosophical complement of a pantheon ; but the spirit which produced the monotheism of the Jews must have been something very different." (P. 390.)

All that need be said here on this interesting question is that those who maintain the opposite opinion, that monotheism did generally

develop and must have developed from polytheism, will have to reckon with Dr. Jevons' argument and facts. He attributes the development of the primitive amorphous monotheism, with its perfect forms in the religion of Israel, to the development of the consciousness of the divine personality, due to greater "attention," on the part of elect souls, to the real content of consciousness. What he says concerning the gradual realization of the content of consciousness and the extraordinary importance of the faculty of attention—though familiar to students of psychology—seems to me worthy of every consideration on the part of the ordinary reader.

G. M. GRANT.

HEILIGE SCHRIFT UND KRITIK. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre von der heiligen Schrift, insonderheit Alten Testamentes. Von D. WILHELM VOLCK, ordentlichem Professor an der Universität Dorpat. Erlangen und Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1897. Pp. x + 216, 8vo. M. 3.25.

THIS is a book of a kind of which one could wish we had more. The author believes profoundly both in the Scriptures and in criticism; and his object is to show that his faith is reasonable and well founded. He thinks himself justified in his faith, because he sees in the Scriptures the product of two factors, one the free divine activity, and the other the free human activity. As a product of the divine activity, the Scriptures are the authoritative standard of faith and life for the church; as a product of human activity, they are, like all literature, a proper subject for investigation and criticism. The treasure is heavenly; but the vessels are earthen.

The book is written by a Lutheran professor, who believes in a supernatural Christianity, which is the complement of a supernatural history, of which the Old Testament is the inspired and authoritative record. He also recognizes the place and value which the modern science of criticism must have in biblical and theological study, and writes in the scientific spirit. He believes that a lack of religion is not essential to the possession of the scientific spirit and the use of the scientific method, and that a man can be religious and scientific at the same time. His view is that the church should openly and gratefully recognize the profit which it has gained from the good work of its